

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/615,553	07/08/2003	Larry G. Willemsen	KSR-10082/05	5826
25006	7590 04/21/2006		EXAMINER	
GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE & CITKOWSKI, P.C			HANSEN, COLBY M	
PO BOX 702 TROY, MI			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBEI	
			3682	
			DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

DATE MAILED:

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO J CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / Willemson PATENT IN REEXAMINATION et al.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. KSR - 10082/05	
10/615,553				
			EXAMINER HANSEN	
		ART UNIT	PAPER	
		3682	04192006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The following is a list of requirements necessary before application may be allowed:

- (1) The reissure declaration is deficient in that applicants have not included at least one reissuable error being corrented. See MPEP 1414. Applicant must include reference to specific language in the patent (claims) that renders the patent invalid and how the new claims overcome the deficiency. New declaration is needed. Unil new declaration has been received, all claims are rejected under 35 USC 251 as being based on an insufficient reissue declaration.
- (2) Several problems exist with respect to amendemnts made.
- (a) The original reissure application (photocopy of the patent) included 5 patented claims. Applicants added new claims 6-10 but also included patented claims 1-5 with the status identifier "(original)"; thus there are two sets of identical claims 1-5.
- (b) In the preliminary amendment dated 12/17/03 applicant amends 7-9 by changing their dependencies. In doing this, applicant enclosed the deleted material in square brackets and underlined the newly added material. These amendments are improper. All amendments must be made relative to the patent, 37 CFR 1.173(g). In order to do this properly, one must compare the original patent (spec., clms., drwgs.) with the proposed amendment. If the amend, language is new to the patent it must be underlined. If words that are in the original patent are deleted they are to be enclosed in square brackets. Claims 7-9 of the preliminary amendment were not part of the original patent. Therefor, the entire claims including claims members must be underlined. Since language (the number 1) is being deleted from a claim that was not part of the original patent the deleted language is not enclosed in square brackets since that designation is needed only to show language deleted from the patent. The proper way to amend claims 7-9 is to totally underline everything and merely delete "1" from the 3 claims.

In order to correct both of theses problems, applicant must submit another amendment with claims 1-10 properly presented.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

PTO-90C (Rev.04-03)